PARASITOLOGY (HELMINTHOLOGY)
WINCHES FARM.
395, HATFIELD ROAD.
ST. ALBANS, HERTS.

VOLUME 2. Part 11 — 28th September, 1951
pp. 305—352

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

28 SEP 1951

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology : Page

Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the present Part 305

Notice of possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases 305

(*continued on back wrapper*)

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

1951

Price Fifteen shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President: Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President: Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.)

Vice-President: Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. Members of the Commission

(*arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.) (*President*) (1st January 1944)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Italy) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Dr. William Thomas Calman (United Kingdom) (1st January 1947)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary: Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist: Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Staff of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Registrar: Mr. A. S. Pankhurst

Publications Officer: Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission: 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust: 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 2, Part 11 (pp. 305–352) *28th September*, 1951

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

1. The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51–56, 57–59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5–13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the international Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

NOTICE is hereby given that normally the International Commission will start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (vol. 2, Part 11) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so, in writing, to the Secretary to the Commission as quickly as possible and in any case in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases

NOTICE is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers is involved in applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in relation to the following names :—

(1) *Nysius* Dallas, 1852, and *Artheneis* Spinola, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), proposed designation of type species for (Z.N.(S.)181).

(2) *Xiphosura* Brünnich, 1771, proposed suppression of, and validation of *Limulus* Müller, 1785 (Class Merostomata) (Z.N.(S.)506).

2. In accordance with the procedure agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56), corresponding Notices have been sent to the journals " Nature " and " Science."

FRANCIS HEMMING
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Secretariat of the
International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature,
28, Park Village East, Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.
28th September, 1951.

REQUEST FOR A RULING THAT THE DISTRIBUTION OF A MICROFILM DOES NOT CONSTITUTE " PUBLICATION " FOR THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 25 OF THE "RÈGLES "

Application submitted jointly by the JOINT COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE FOR PALEONTOLOGY IN AMERICA and by the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)528)

(Letter, with enclosures, dated 6th February 1951, signed jointly by Dr. G. Winston Sinclair (for the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America) and Dr. Richard E. Blackwelder (for the Nomenclature Committee, Society of Systematic Zoology).)

We enclose a petition which we would ask you to lay before the Commission for their opinion, and which we would ask you also to publish in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.*

We also enclose a list of zoologists who, having seen the petition and studied it, have indicated in writing that they wish to be recorded as supporting it. Dwight Davis (Chicago Natural History Museum) wishes to be recorded as opposing the petition.

Enclosure

Within recent years there has arisen, at least in America, a commerce in copies of books or manuscripts photographically reproduced on 35mm, film, known as " microfilm." This practice was at first a convenience to scholars, who could thus obtain copies of rare or unobtainable works for study and reference, and the microfilm was usually supplied by large libraries.

From this beginning the practice has expanded, until now not only books but unpublished typescripts are being offered for sale, and microfilm is being advertised as a cheap and convenient method of " publishing " scholarly works which (because of their bulk or their lack of general appeal) would not be readily accepted by a regular publishing house. The distribution and offering for sale of such microfilm is held by some, including high academic officers, to constitute publication.

We ask the Commission to rule that, regardless of its status for other purposes material which is available to the public only in the form of microfilm is not to be considered " published " within the meaning of the *Règles.*

Should the Commission prefer to have before them a definite example, may we suggest that the following case be considered :

In 1948 a paper entitled " Pre-Traverse Devonian Pelecypods of Michigan," by Aurele LaRocque, was offered for sale as " University Microfilms Publication 1059," consisting of a microfilm copy of a typescript and accompanying plates of photographs. This offering was advertised to an extensive mailing-list of libraries and others, and the paper has been available to the public in this form since 1948.

In 1950 the same paper was issued in printed form as : Contributions from the Museum of Paleontology, University of Michigan, Volume 7, No. 10, (pp. 271-366, 19 plates).

In this paper (in both forms) are described three new genera and fourteen new species of pelecypods.

We ask the Commission to rule that the names of these new taxonomic units are to be ignored until their appearance in printed form in 1950.

Annex to Enclosure

Annex to Enclosure.

List of zoologists supporting the petition :

Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America. Members individually polled and unanimous in support, viz. :

Raymond C. Moore, University of Kansas, Lawrence
A. S. Romer, Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Mass.
David H. Dunkle, U.S. National Museum, Washington
S. W. Muller, Stanford University, California
J. Marvin Weller, Walker Museum, University of Chicago
John B. Reeside, Jr., U.S. Geological Survey, Washington
D. L. Frizzell, Rolla, Missouri
A. Myra Keen, Stanford University, California
Katherine V. W. Palmer, Ithaca, New York
J. Brookes Knight, U.S. National Museum, Washington
John W. Wells, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
G. Winston Sinclair, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Individual zoologists in Chicago, in favour of the petition :

Karl P. Schmidt
Fritz Haas
Bryan Patterson
Rainer Zangerl
Rupert Wenzel
William Beecher
Henry S. Dybas
Robert H. Denison
Robert F. Inger
Emmett R. Blake
Austin L. Rand
Melvin A. Taylor, Jr.
Colin Campbell Sanborn
Eugene S. Richardson, Jr.

Nomenclature Committee, Society of Systematic Zoology Members, individually polled ; all replies were approval :

Ernst Mayr, American Museum Natural History
Robert R. Miller, Univ. of Michigan
Robert L. Usinger, Univ. of California
John W. Wells, Cornell Univ.
Ellsworth C. Dougherty, Univ. of California
J. Brookes Knight, U.S. National Museum
E. Raymond Hall, Univ. of Kansas
Richard E. Blackwelder, U.S. National Museum.

SUPPORT FOR THE REQUEST SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE FOR A RULING THAT THE DISTRIBUTION OF A SCIENTIFIC PAPER ON MICROFILM DOES NOT CONSTITUTE PUBLICATION FOR THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 25 OF THE " RÈGLES "

Communication received from the COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)528)

(Letter dated 7th May, 1951)

The Committee on Nomenclature of the Scientific Staff of the American Museum of Natural History has noted the petition addressed to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature concerning the publication of zoological names on microfilm. This Committee has unanimously approved of the measures proposed in the said petition (as published in *Science*, vol. **113**, p. 466, 1951) and would join in the recommendation that the names in " Pre-Traverse Devonian Pelecypods of Michigan " by Aurele LaRoque, be ignored until their appearance in printed form in 1950, and that all material that is available to the public only in the form of microfilm be considered as not published within the meaning of the *Règles*. We would further suggest that it be specifically noted that subsequent authentic publication does not validate the earlier appearance on microfilm.

Committee on Nomenclature :
Mont A. Cazier
Edwin H. Colbert
Norman D. Newall
George H. H. Tate
John T. Zimmer (*Chairman*)

ON THE REQUEST SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE FOR A RULING THAT THE DISTRIBUTION OF A SCIENTIFIC PAPER ON MICROFILM DOES NOT CONSTITUTE "PUBLICATION" FOR THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 25 OF THE "RÈGLES"

By CHARLES H. BLAKE

(*Department of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*)

Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)528)

(Letter dated 30th April, 1951)

In *Science* for 20 April, 1951, I find a petition submitted by Messrs. Sinclair and Blackwelder. I find myself in opposition to the petition, at least in so far as it seems clear what grounds are used as a basis for it.

(1) Letter press printing, or its sensible equivalents such as photo-offset, are not an integral or necessary part of publication.

(2) All that seems necessary in publication is that copies shall be available to the interested public and that the copies shall all be clearly identical. Both of these qualifications appear to be inherent in the microfilm publication complained of.

(3) It is evidently intended that these microfilms will constitute publications and are not restricted as manifolded manuscript. The petition itself notes that they are advertised to an extensive list of persons and libraries.

(4) There appears to be no reason why the author of one of these microfilm publications should not distribute separates of it in the fashion of printed matter.

(5) I can say from personal experience that no special reading machine is actually needed to handle microfilm ; any zoological laboratory can read it with an ordinary dissecting microscope.

(6) Although not offered as an objection to microfilm in the present petition, I have been told that some object that the quality of the reproduction is not sufficiently high. Personal experience with microfilm indicates that, when properly made and properly enlarged in a magnifier, the figures are at least the equal of many that find their way into the printed literature.

ON THE REQUEST TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE FOR A RULING THAT THE DISTRIBUTION OF A SCIENTIFIC PAPER ON MICROFILM DOES NOT CONSTITUTE "PUBLICATION" FOR THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 25 OF THE "RÈGLES"

By E. H. BEHRE

(*Louisana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)528)

(Letter dated 4th May, 1951)

The occasion of the petition to your body from the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, and the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology determines me to add my words to those of other zoologists. I wish most emphatically to support the petition of these Committees, the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America and the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology. I do not have, at hand, an immediate example of such clarity as is offered in the committees' petition; but I, myself, am confident that in the course of a short time such examples will appear in many specific fields. It is indeed a critical issue and one which should be clarified as promptly as possible before the resulting confusions accumulate in literature.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL THAT THE DISTRIBUTION OF SCIENTIFIC PAPERS ON MICROFILMS SHOULD BE RULED AS NOT CONSTITUTING PUBLICATION FOR THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 25 OF THE "RÈGLES"

By the " ZOOLOGICAL RECORD " COMMITTEE OF THE ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)528)

(Letter dated 18th July, 1951, from Dr. Sheffield A. Neave, Chairman, " Zoological Record " Committee of the Zoological Society of London)

At its meeting held on Tuesday, 17th July, the " Zoological Record " Committee, the body entrusted by the Zoological Society of London with responsibility for supervising and determining on its behalf all matters relating to the publication of the *Zoological Record*, had under consideration the practice adopted on one or two recent occasions of giving publicity to new scientific names in microfilms containing the text of, or summaries of, as yet unpublished papers and, in particular, the question whether the giving of publicity to a new name by the distribution of microfilms in which it appears was to be regarded as constituting the publication of that name for the purposes of Article 25 of the *Règles Internationales* and therefore as entitling the name in question to be recorded in the *Zoological Record* as having been published as from the date on which the microfilm containing that name was placed on sale or otherwise distributed.

The " Zoological Record " Committee asked me, as its Chairman, to convey to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature their emphatic view that the distribution of microfilms containing new names is open to the strongest possible objection and represents a procedure which, if countenanced, could not fail to give rise to the most serious confusion in zoological nomenclature. In the opinion of the Committee, it is highly important that this objectionable practice should be nipped in the bud before it has had time to give rise to serious difficulties.

For the foregoing reasons the Committee adopted the following Resolution :

The " Zoological Record " Committee emphatically associates itself with the proposal which it understands has already been submitted jointly by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America and the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should at the earliest possible date give a ruling that the distribution in microfilm of a paper containing a new scientific name does not constitute the publication, for the purposes of the *Règles Internationales*, of the new names included in such microfilms and therefore that no scientific name given publicity by this means thereby acquires any rights under the Law of Priority. The " Zoological Record " Committee further recommends that the International Commission should at the same time adopt a " Declaration " strongly condemning the use of microfilms for giving publicity for

unpublished scientific names and proposing that the International Congress of Zoology should be asked at Copenhagen in 1953 to insert a " Recommandation " in the *Règles* in the foregoing sense.

The meeting of the Zoological Record Committee at which the foregoing Resolutions were adopted was attended by: Dr. Sheffield A. Neave, C.M.G., O.B.E., D.Sc. (*Chairman*); Dr. William J. Hall, M.C., D.Sc.; Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.; Sir Norman Kinnear, C.B.; Mr. Terence Morrison-Scott, D.S.C., M.A., M.Sc.; Dr. Malcolm Smith, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.; Dr. C. J. Stubblefield, D.Sc., F.R.S.; Dr. L. Harrison Matthews, Sc.D. (*Scientific Director and Deputy Secretary, Zoological Society of London*).

ON DR. L. R. COX'S PROPOSAL THAT S. A. RENIER'S " PRODROMO " AND THE " PROSPETTO DELLA CLASSE DEI VERMI " SHOULD BE DECLARED NOT TO HAVE BEEN PUBLISHED WITHIN THE MEANING OF ARTICLE 25 OF THE " RÈGLES "

By the late R. WINCKWORTH (*London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)432)

(Extract from a letter dated 10th November, 1949)

I want to thank you for your letter of 2nd November about Cox's application[2] that the International Commission should give a ruling that S. A. Renier's *Prodromo* and the *Prospetto della Classe dei Vermi* was not published within the meaning of Article 25 of the *Règles*, and to say that I entirely concur with the proposals submitted.

[2] See pp. 299-300 of the present volume.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE TYPE SPECIES FOR THE GENERA "NYSIUS" DALLAS, 1852, AND "ARTHENEIS" SPINOLA, 1837 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA)

By R. L. USINGER (*United States Public Health Service*) and
R. I. SAILER (*United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)181)

China (1943, *The Generic Names of British Insects*, pt. 8 : 236), has shown that, under the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature the name *Nysius* Dallas, 1852 (*List Specimens Hem. Ins. Coll. Brit. Mus.* **2** : 551), is not applicable to the genus universally known under that name. Through an oversight China cited *Macroparius* Stål, 1872 (*Ofvers. VetenskAkad. Förhandl.*, Stockholm **29** : 43), as the correct name instead of *Artheneis* Spinola, 1837 (*Ess. Ins. Hémipt.* : 250), which he listed as a synonym. In subsequent correspondence he agreed that the latter name must be employed for this genus of LYGAEIDAE. Unfortunately, this change would produce much confusion in literature of economic entomology since the name *Nysius* has become virtually synonymous with "false chinch bug" and "Rutherglen bug," two important pests of agricultural crops in Europe, North America, and Australia. It seems advisable, therefore, to request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to take appropriate action under suspension of the Rules in order to maintain *Nysius* for the genus of bugs to which it has long been applied.

The change to either *Macroparius* or *Artheneis* is not made necessary through any misconception of the groups involved but simply through two unfortunate type selections. Distant (1903), ignoring the carefully defined subgenera of Stål (1874, (*Enum. Hemipt.* **4** : 119–122,) and Horváth (1890, *Rev. Ent.* **9** : 185–191) considered the genus *Nysius* as a unit and selected *Nysius zealandicus* Dallas, 1852, as its type species. *N. zealandicus* has previously been set apart by Stål (in 1868 (*K. svensk. Vetensk Akad. Handl.*, Stockholm (n.f.) **7** (No. 11) : 76) in a monotypic subgenus, *Rhypodes*, and *Nysius* was used for the cosmopolitan group including *Lygaeus thymi* Wolff, 1804 (*Icon. Cimicum* (4) : 149) and its allies. This did not exclude *zealandicus* from consideration as the type species of *Nysius*, since Dallas included it as one of the original species. Distant continued to use the name *Nysius* for the false chinch bug and its allies until his death. However, Evans (1929) raised most of the subgenera, including *Rhypodes*, to full genera. This should have precipitated the matter, because the name *Nysius* should have been used in place of *Rhypodes*, and the next oldest synonym should have been selected for *Nysius* auct. *nec* Dallas. However, Distant's type selection was overlooked, and it remained for Dr. China to point out the nomenclatural inconsistency in 1943.

Meanwhile, Kirkaldy (1909) noted that, as Spinola himself had suggested, *Artheneis* Spinola, 1837 (a common European genus and the type of the subfamily ARTHENEINAE), actually comprised two genera. Instead of following general usage and selecting *Artheneis foveolata* Spinola, 1837 (*Ess. Ins. Hémipt.* : 253) as the type species of *Artheneis*, Kirkaldy cited "(type *eymoides*), = *Nysius*

Dallas, 1852" [sic], thus confusing the *Nysius* picture and necessitating a new name. *Pyrrhonysius* which he proposed (1909, *Canad. Ent.* **41**: 31) for *Arthenicus* auct., *nec* Kirkaldy. It is not clear whether Kirkaldy intended to replace *Nysius* with *Arthenicus* or not. He described many new species of *Nysius* in 1910 but the paper was published posthumously. We have seen no evidence in his published works or in his private collection to indicate that he contemplated a change in the name *Nysius*.

Oshanin (1912) ignored the earlier type fixations and selected type species designed to legalize current usage. Oshanin's type selections were accepted by Van Duzee in his "Check List" (1916) and "Catalogue" (1917) and have been generally, though incorrectly, accepted by hemipterists up to the present time.

Thus we are faced with a situation in which two authors selected type species which completely upset existing usage. The changes were entirely unnecessary and it seems clear that the authors had no intention of changing anything because they failed to make the changes in their own subsequent work. Under the Rules their intentions are, of course, of no consequence, but considered in connection with the economic importance of the group and the universal acceptance of the names in current usage, it seems justifiable to consider action under suspension of the Rules which would permit retention of the name *Nysius* for the concept with which it has been universally associated.

We therefore respectfully recommend that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature exercise the plenary power conferred on it by the International Congress of Zoology and that the following actions be taken:

(1) Reject Distant's (1903) selection of *Nysius zelandicus* Dallas, 1852, in favour of Oshanin's (1912) selection of *Lygaeus thymi* Wolff, 1804, as the type species of *Nysius* Dallas, 1852.

(2) Reject Kirkaldy's (1909) selection of *Arthenicus cymoides* Spinola, 1837, in favour of Oshanin's (1912) selection of *Arthenicus fossulatus* Spinola, 1837, as the type species of *Arthenicus* Spinola, 1837.

(3) Place the generic names *Nysius* Dallas, 1852, and *Arthenicus* Spinola, 1837, with the respective type species specified above on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, together with the generic name *Rhyparochromus* Stal, 1868 (type species by monotypy: *Nysius zelandicus* Dallas, 1852).

Conclusions

Suppression of the Distant and Kirkaldy type selections will result in the following:

Nysius Dallas, 1852, type species *Lygaeus thymi* Wolff, 1804 — *Metroxerus* Stal, 1872, type species *Heterogaster graminicola* Kolenati, 1846.

Rhyparochromus Stal, 1868, type species, *Nysius zelandicus* Dallas, 1852 — *Lygaeus clavicornis* Fabricius, 1794, (*Ent. syst.* **4**: 169) — (*Myersia* Evans, 1929 *Bull. ent. Res.* **19**: 353), type species *Lygaeus clavicornis* Fabricius, 1794.

Arthenicus Spinola, 1837, type species, *Arthenicus fossulatus* Spinola, 1837 — *Pyrrhonysius* Kirkaldy, 1900, type species *Arthenicus fossulatus* Spinola, 1837.

ON THE APPLICATION FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE TYPE SPECIES FOR THE GENERA " NYSIUS " DALLAS, 1852, AND " ARTHENEIS " SPINOLA, 1837 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA) SUBMITTED BY PROFESSOR ROBERT L. USINGER AND DR. R. I. SAILER

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)181)

1. The application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for the use of the plenary powers for the purpose of varying the type species of the genera *Nysius* Dallas, 1852, and *Artheneis* Spinola, 1837, prepared jointly by Professor Robert L. Usinger (University of California, Berkeley, California, at that time of the United States Public Health Service) and Dr. R. I. Sailer (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) was received on 15th February, 1945, under cover of a letter from Dr. Sailer, dated 12th January, 1945. This application had already (December 1944) been published by these authors (*Proc. ent. Soc. Wash.* **46** : 260-262). Unfortunately, wartime and post-war difficulties, including an unavoidable change in the Commission's printers, made it impossible to publish this application before the meeting of the International Congress of Zoology in Paris in 1948, while since then it was necessary until recently to husband the financial resources of the Commission to secure the publication of the volumes of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing the Paris records.

2. Three decisions taken by the Paris Congress slightly affect the present application, namely the establishment of the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* and the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*. Under the first of those decisions there are to be inscribed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*, among other trivial names, the trivial names of the type species of each genus, the name of which is placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, except where such a trivial name is not the oldest available trivial name for the species in question. In such a case the oldest such trivial name is to be placed on the *Official List* in lieu of the trivial name of the nominal species which is the type species of the genus concerned (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 269-271, 283-284). Under the second of these decisions, there are to be added to the *Official Index* names suppressed by the Commission or declared by the Commission to be invalid. Under the third of these decisions, it is necessary now to record the gender of every generic name placed on the *Official List*.

3. Applying these decisions to the present case, we find that, if the Commission approve the proposals set forth in Professor Usinger's and Dr. Sailor's application, the trivial names *thymi* Wolff, 1804 (as published in the binominal combination *Lygaeus thymi*) (which in that event will have become the type species of *Nysius* Dallas, 1852) and *foveolata* Spinola, 1837 (as published in

the binominal combination *Artheneis foveolata*) (which in that event will have become the type species of *Artheneis* Spinola, 1837) will require to be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*. The trivial name (*zealandicus* Dallas, 1852, as published in the binominal combination *Nysius zealandicus*) of the type species of *Rhypodes* Stål, 1868, will not be added to the *Official List*, since it is not regarded by specialists as the oldest available trivial name for the species in question ; the later name *clavicornis* Fabricius, 1794 (as published in the binominal combination *Lygaeus clavicornis*), that being, as Professor Usinger and Dr. Sailor explain, the trivial name now regarded by specialists as the oldest such name either subjectively or objectively available for the species in question, will, however, need to be placed on the *Official List*. Under the decision (under the plenary powers) recommended by Professor Usinger and Dr. Sailor, the generic name *Tyrrheneis* Kirkaldy, 1909, will become an objective junior synonym of *Artheneis* Spinola, 1837 (the two genera having the same species as their respective type species) and will need therefore to be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*. In their application Professor Usinger and Dr. Sailor point out that the generic name *Myersia* Evans, 1929 (*Bull. ent. Res.* **19** : 353) is a subjective junior synonym of *Rhypodes* Stål, 1868. In addition, it may be noted that the name *Myersia* Evans, 1929, is a junior homonym of *Myersia* Viereck, 1912 (*Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.* **43** (No. 1942) : 575) ; as such, it should therefore also be placed on the *Official Index*.

4. As regards the form of action under the plenary powers which would be necessary to secure the objects sought by Professor Usinger and Dr. Sailor, it may be recalled that at its Session held in Lisbon in 1935 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature took a decision on procedure in cases of this kind, when considering a long list of applications relating to the type species of genera in the Order Hymenoptera submitted by Professor J. Chester Bradley (1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 27-30). In view of the risk that, concealed in the literature there might be some undetected type selection which, if not suppressed, might nullify the result sought to be obtained by the use of the plenary powers, if those powers were to be used solely to suppress some type designation or type selection that it was known would create confusion unless suppressed, the Commission formed the conclusion that it would be preferable to set aside all type selections made prior to the decision in question and itself to designate whatever species it was desired should be the type species of the genera in question. The advantages of this procedure are so clear that it has since become the standard practice in all cases of this kind.

5. In the light of the foregoing considerations, it may be convenient to summarise as follows the action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature would need to take, in the event of its deciding to meet the substance of the application submitted to it in this matter, namely :—

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all type selections for the undermentioned genera made prior to the decision now proposed to be

taken and to designate the species specified below to be the type species of the genera concerned :—

Name of genus	*Nominal species proposed to be designated as the type species of the genus specified in Col.* (1)
(1)	(2)
(*a*) *Nysius* Dallas, 1852	*Lygaeus thymi* Wolff, 1804
(*b*) *Artheneis* Spinola, 1837	*Artheneis foveolata* Spinola, 1837

(2) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *Nysius* Dallas, 1852 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by designation, as proposed in (1) (*a*) above, under the plenary powers : *Lygaeus thymi* Wolff, 1804) ;

(*b*) *Artheneis* Spinola, 1837 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by designation, as proposed in (1) (*b*) above, under the plenary powers : *Artheneis foveolata* Spinola, 1837) ;

(*c*) *Rhypodes* Stål, 1868 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by monotypy : *Nysius zealandicus* Dallas, 1852) ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *thymi* Wolff, 1804 (as published in the binominal combination *Lygaeus thymi*) (trivial name of species proposed, under (1) (*a*) above to be designated under the plenary powers as type species of *Nysius* Dallas, 1852) ;

(*b*) *foveolata* Spinola, 1837 (as published in the binominal combination *Artheneis foveolata*) (trivial name of species proposed, under (1) (*b*) above, to be designated under the plenary powers as type species of *Artheneis* Spinola, 1837) ;

(*c*) *clavicornis* Fabricius, 1794 (as published in the binominal combination *Lygaeus clavicornis*) ;

(4) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *Tyrrheneis* Kirkaldy, 1909 (an objective synonym of *Artheneis* Spinola, 1837, under the decision proposed in (1) (*b*) above) ;

(*b*) *Myersia* Evans, 1929 (a junior homonym of *Rhypodes* Stål, 1868).

ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE TYPE SPECIES FOR "NYSIUS" DALLAS, 1852, AND "ARTHENEIS" SPINOLA, 1837 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA): SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY PROFESSOR ROBERT L. USINGER AND DR. R. I. SAILER

By W. E. CHINA, Sc.D.

(*Deputy Keeper, Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)181)

(Enclosure to a letter dated 30th May, 1951)

In my paper on the generic names of the British Heteroptera (1943, *The gen. Names brit. Ins.* (8): 237) I pointed out (Note 1 to genus 2) that Distant (1903, *Faun. brit. India*, Rhyn. **2**: 17) was the first author validly to fix the type species of the genus *Nysius* Dallas, 1852 (*List Spec. hemipt. Ins. Coll. Brit. Mus.* **2**: 551). In consequence the generic name *Rhyparodes* Stal, 1868 (with type species *Nysius zealandicus* Dallas) became a synonym of *Nysius* Dallas, 1852, while *Nysius* auctt., *nec* Dallas had to take the next available name. By an extraordinary *lapsus*, I selected the relatively modern name *Macroparius* Stål, 1872 (type species: *Heterogaster* [nec] *graminicola* Kolenati), leaving the much older name *Artheneis* Spinola, 1837 (type species: *Artheneis cymodes* Spinola) as a synonym. By this mistaken sinking of *Artheneis* under *Macroparius*, I overlooked the serious consequences of transferring the type genus of the Lygaeid subfamily ARTHENEINAE to another subfamily (LYGAEINAE) and even kept the subfamily name ARTHENEINAE on page 238. The fact that the old genus *Artheneis* (type species: *A. forcolata* Spinola) does not occur in Britain made this error possible, as in my paper I tended to skim over non-British genera. When my attention was drawn to this slip by Dr. R. L. Usinger, I at once agreed with him that the case would have to be submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in order to preserve the name of the type genus of the ARTHENEINAE and the well known generic concept *Nysius*. This case was set out by Usinger and Sailer in 1944 (*Proc. ent. Soc. Wash.* **46** (9): 260-262) and I herewith express my complete concurrence with their opinions.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE ENTRY ON THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF THE NAME "LIMULUS" MÜLLER, 1785 (CLASS MEROSTOMATA*): PROPOSED CORRECTION OF AN ERROR IN "OPINION" 104

By LEIF STØRMER
(*Paleontologisk Institut, Oslo, Norway*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)506)

1. The object of the present applicationis to obtain from the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature the use of its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing the generic name *Xiphosura* Brünnich, 1771, in order thereby to render the name *Limulus* Müller, 1785 (Class Merostomata*) the oldest available name for, and therefore the valid name of, the genus now habitually known by that name. From the point of view of the present applicant, who is engaged in preparing the chapter on Merostomata for the forthcoming international *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*, the present case is one of exceptional urgency, for it is essential that a decision should be provided on the issue now submitted in time for it to be included in the relevant portion of the *Treatise*. It is particularly hoped, therefore, that it will be possible for the International Commission to reach a very early decision on the present application.

2. The facts of this case are as follows: In 1928, in *Opinion* 104 (*Smithson. miscel. Coll.* **73** (No. 5): 25) the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the generic name *Limulus* Müller (O.F.), 1785 (type species, by monotypy: *Monoculus polyphemus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1**: 634). This extremely well-known name, which was then in universal use—as it still is today—was regarded not only as a nomenclatorially valid name, but also as the oldest available name for the genus in question. In 1940, however, the late R. Winckworth submitted a request to the International Commission (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1**: 113-117) for a ruling on the question whether in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta* (then believed to have been published in 1772, but now known to have been first published in 1771) Brünnich had applied the principles of binominal nomenclature. Winckworth pointed out that, if the Commission were to give an affirmative answer to the foregoing question, there were a number of generic names which would in future rank for priority as from the *Zool. Fund.* and that one of these names, *Xiphosura* Brünnich (: 208), was older than, and would replace, the well-known name *Limulus* Müller, 1785. At Paris in 1948 the International Commission ruled in favour of the availability of the names in Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, holding the view that in this work Brünnich had duly complied with the requirements of Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles* (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 307-310).

* Or Class Arachnida.

3. Having reached this general decision, the International Commission turned to consider the new names in the *Fundamenta* of Brünnich, of which it now became necessary to take account. When the Commission reached the name *Xiphosura* Brünnich, the Acting President (Mr. Francis Hemming) drew attention to the fact that the acceptance of this generic name would be objectionable from two points of view (1950, *loc. cit.* **4** : 311-312). First, that name, if accepted, would displace the time-honoured name *Limulus* Müller, which, moreover, had already been on the *Official List* for twenty years ; second, the use of this word as a generic name would be confusing, in view of the fact that it was in general use as the name of the Order to which this genus belonged. The Commission did not feel able on that occasion to reach a decision on this question, but agreed that as soon as possible after the close of the Paris Congress consideration should be given to the question whether or not the plenary powers should be used for the purpose of validating the generic name *Limulus* Müller and thereby of regularising the position of that name on the *Official List* (1950, *loc. cit.* **4** : 312). At the same time the Commission asked the Secretary to confer with specialists and, having done so, to submit a Report to the Commission for consideration.

4. It will be seen, therefore, that the subject of the present application is one to which the Commission has already given preliminary consideration and on which it has asked for the views of specialists. Thus, the present application, although prompted mainly by a different object, namely a desire to obtain a decision needed for the preparation of the *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*, will serve also to provide a basis for the consideration of the question to which the Commission gave special consideration in Paris, namely whether the position on the *Official List* of the name *Limulus* Müller should be regularised or, alternatively, whether that name should be removed from the *Official List*, the name *Xiphosura* Brünnich being added thereto in its place.

5. As has already been explained, the generic name *Limulus* Müller is in general use for the genus to which it was first applied by Müller, one hundred and sixty-six years ago. It is true that in 1902 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7) **9** : 260) Pocock sought to replace the name *Limulus* Müller by the older name *Xiphosura* Gronovius, 1764 (*Zoophylac. gron.* **2** : 220) but this proposal of his won no support from other workers. Moreover, the *Zoophylacium gronovianum*, as from which Pocock dated the name *Xiphosura* was written by an author (Gronovius) who, though a so-called " binary " author, did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature. At the time that Pocock wrote his paper there was room for argument whether a generic name published by such an author possessed any status in zoological nomenclature and this doubt persisted until 1948 when the International Congress of Zoology made it quite clear that such names possess no status in zoological nomenclature, by deleting the ambiguous expression " nomenclature binaire " from the *Règles*, inserting in its place the perfectly definite expression " nomenclature binominale " (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 63-66). It is now perfectly clear that the alleged generic name *Xiphosura* Gronovius, 1764, possesses no standing in zoological nomenclature. This objection does not however apply to the name *Xiphosura* Brünnich, 1771, which is undoubtedly an available name. In view of the

current general acceptance of the generic name *Limulus* Müller and the long period in which it has been in use, the desirability of promoting stability in nomenclature points strongly in favour of the preservation of the name *Limulus* Müller, as against the name *Xiphosura* Brünnich. These considerations are enormously strengthened by the fact that for over twenty years the name *Limulus* Müller has occupied an unchallenged position on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The arguments would need to be very strong to justify the dethronement of the name *Limulus* Müller for the benefit of the unknown name *Xiphosura* Brünnich. In actual fact there are no arguments that can be advanced in favour of the overthrow of existing practice in this matter, apart from that based on the consideration that Brünnich's name *Xiphosura* was published fourteen years before Müller's name *Limulus*. The Law of Priority possesses many important merits, but it is important always to remember that that Law was fashioned to promote stability and uniformity in nomenclature and consequently that the purpose of that Law is defeated if, by an unduly rigid application of its provisions, it is allowed to become an instrument for overturning well-established nomenclatorial practice. There are therefore very strong grounds in favour of the use by the International Commission of its plenary powers to preserve the name *Limulus* Müller.

6. This matter is not, however, the sole concern of the student of the taxonomy of the living and fossil forms concerned. For the name *Limulus* Müller is deeply embedded in the literature of the morphology and ontogeny of this interesting group, and to the workers in the field of applied biology changes of well-known names for narrow technical reasons of a purely nomenclatorial character are peculiarly irritating and incomprehensible. Moreover, the International Congress of Zoology has given express directions that the interests of this class of worker are to be given special consideration by the International Commission in considering cases involving the possible displacement of well-known names (*see*, 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 234-235). For this reason also it is highly desirable that the International Commission should use its plenary powers to prevent the supercession of the name *Limulus* Müller.

7. Finally, it must be observed that (as was pointed out in the discussion of this case in Paris) we are confronted here also with a reason of quite a different kind which would make it most undesirable that the name *Xiphosura* Brünnich should replace the name *Limulus* Müller. This is because the word (Xiphosura) of which Brünnich's name consists or derivatives of that word are commonly used to denote the higher categories to which the genus now known as *Limulus* belongs. Thus, according to the taxonomic view taken of the categories which should be recognised, the word " Xiphosura " is in use as the name of the Sub-Class or Order concerned, while the word " Xiphosurida " is used as the name of the Order. The Commission has ruled (in *Opinion* 102) that a generic name is not invalidated by the prior use, as an ordinal name, of the word of which that generic name is composed and this provision has since been incorporated in the *Règles* ; in deciding so to codify this provision, the International Congress of Zoology decided also to insert a *Recommandation* deprecating the selection, as generic names, of words previously used as the names of units of Sub-Ordinal or higher category (1950, *Bull. zool.*

Nomencl. **4** : 164-165). In the present case, the use of the word " Xiphosura " as a generic name could not fail to give rise to confusion in the nomenclature of this group, and it is therfore extremely desirable from this point of view alone that the Commission should use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Xiphosura* Brünnich, 1771.

8. For the reasons set forth above, I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Xiphosura* Brünnich, 1771, for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) in view of (1) above, to confirm the generic name *Limulus* Müller, 1785, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned generic names or reputed generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :-

(*a*) *Xiphosura* Gronovius, 1764 (an invalid name because published by an author who did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature) ;

(*b*) *Xiphosura* Brünnich, 1771 (a name proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers) ;

(4) to place on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zology* the trivial name *polyphemus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Monoculus polyphemus*) (trivial name of the type species of *Limulus* Müller, 1785).

ON THE QUESTION WHETHER IT IS DESIRABLE THAT THE GENERIC NAME " LIMULUS " MÜLLER, 1785, SHOULD BE VALIDATED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS AND CONFIRMED IN ITS POSITION ON THE " OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY "

By H. MUNRO FOX, F.R.S.

(*London University, Bedford College, London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)506)

(Extract from a letter dated 12th March, 1951)

I am strongly of the opinion that the generic name *Limulus* Müller should be validated and confirmed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The contrary course would be most undesirable both because of text-book usage and because of the undesirability of removing a name from the *Official List*.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL THAT THE NAME "LIMULUS" MÜLLER, 1785 (CLASS MEROSTOMATA) SHOULD BE VALIDATED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS AND CONFIRMED ON THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY"

By CARL O. DUNBAR

(*Yale University, Peabody Museum of Natural History, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)506)

(Extract from a letter dated 23rd May, 1951)

I think that both the *Official List of Generic Names* and the provision for the use of the plenary powers are desirable as a proper means of escape from unnecessary confusion, sometimes produced by rigid application of the rule of priority, against which a good many systematists are inclined to rebel. It would seem to me therefore that the name *Limulus* Müller, having been established by being placed on the *Official List*, cannot be displaced by *Xiphosura* Brünnich unless the Commission saw fit to take the positive action of removing it from the *List*.

As for the merits of the case, I believe no useful purpose would be gained by replacing the name *Limulus* which is so well established in the literature of the world. On the other hand, definite confusion would result from use of the name *Xiphosura* for a genus within the Order Xiphosura.

ON THE QUESTION OF THE TYPE SPECIES OF "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1801 (CLASS PELECYPODA): COMMENT ON PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY M. GILBERT RANSON, TOGETHER WITH A SUPPLEMENTARY REQUEST FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE TRIVIAL NAME "GRYPHUS" LINNAEUS, 1758 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "ANOMIA GRYPHUS")

By L. R. COX, Sc.D., F.R.S.

(*Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History), London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

1. The present paper is submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in response to the recently published request by the Secretary to the Commission (Hemming, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2**: 239-240) for the views of interested specialists on the proposal relating to the determination of the type species of the genus *Gryphaea* Lamarck submitted to the Commission by M. Gilbert Ranson (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 168-170).

2. In that application (as in other previously published papers) M. Ranson concluded that the type species of the genus *Gryphaea* Lamarck is the living Portuguese Oyster, *Gryphaea angulata* Lamark, 1819 (*Hist. nat. Anim. sans Vertèbr.* **6** (1): 198). Arguments leading to a different conclusion, namely that the type species of this genus is *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck, 1801 (*Syst. Anim. sans Vertèbr.*: 398), have, however, been advanced by various workers. These arguments are examined in the following paragraphs.

3. In 1898 (*Tertiary Fauna Florida*: 672) Dall (W. H.) showed: (*a*) that the name *Gryphaea* was first published by Lamarck in his *Systême des Animaux sans Vertèbres*; (*b*) that, although the name *Gryphaea angulata* was the first name there listed under *Gryphaea*, it was a *nomen nudum* and therefore that the species in question was not available for selection as type species; (*c*) that several of the names there cited under *Gryphaea* were founded with indications adequate to establish the identity of the species concerned, which therefore were available for subsequent selection as type species. The most important of those species is *Gryphaea arcuata*. Dall's opinion that it was virtually selected as type species by Bosc in 1802 cannot, however, be accepted. Hertlein (1933, *Trans. San Diego Soc. nat. Hist.* **7**: 278) referred to an alleged type selection of *G. arcuata* by Chenu in 1858. The earliest valid selection now known is however by Anton in 1839, who also selected *G. arcuata*. This fact seems first to have been recorded in print by H. B. Stenzel (1947, *J. Paleont.* **21**: 174). It is most improbable that an earlier selection of one of the species available form the *Systême* will now be found.

4. Monsieur Ranson attempts to counter these arguments by maintaining that the *Systême* is a work which should be disregarded in discussions on nomenclature. His reasons (if I understand him correctly) are: (*a*) that the

International Commission rendered an *Opinion* (*Opinion* 78) the meaning of which was that citations of single species in this work under previously established genera cannot be accepted as type selections ; (*b*) that it was a provisional and premature work, as shown by the fact that Lamarck many years later (1819, *Hist. nat. Anim. sans Vertèbr.* **6** (1) : 198-200) changed the names of some species included in it and certain references given under other species. He therefore considers that the first publication of *Gryphaea* which can be accepted was by Lamarck (1819, *op. cit.*) and that a selection of *G. angulata* was validly established as from that work as the type species by Children (1823).

5. Even though it means repeating much that has been said by previous writers, I will deal in turn with these other and points made by Monsieur Ranson.

(a) Status of Lamarck's " Systême "

6. This work unquestionably fulfils the necessary conditions to constitute a valid publication under the International Rules. The fact that it does not contain type selections is quite irrelevant to this question. Equally fallacious is the argument that the *Systême* should be rejected because it was a premature work. Most systematists change their minds on some questions of synonymy and classification during the course of eighteen years, but their earlier works do not thereby lose their status as publications. If, nevertheless, it were to be held that the *Systême* should be suppressed by the International Commission in order that *G. angulata* should become available for selection as type species of *Gryphaea*, it must be remembered that lengthy researches would have to be made on possible repercussions on the nomenclature of other genera included in that work. Nor should it be forgotten that between 1801 and 1819 the generic name *Gryphaea* was published by at least four other workers (Bosc, 1802 ; Roissy, 1805 ; J. Sowerby, 1815 ; Cuvier, 1817), from any of whose works *G. arcuata* (or its synonym *G. incurva* J. Sowerby) would be available for selection as type species of the genus to the exclusion of the then still underscribed *G. angulata*.

(b) Is the generic name " Gryphaea " validly established in the " Systême " ?

7. The answer to this question is that the name *Gryphaea* unquestionably was so established. A generic diagnosis was given and certain clearly recognizable nominal species were included in the genus.

(c) Which of the species included under " Gryphaea " by Lamarck in the " Systême " are clearly recognizable and hence available for subsequent selection as type species ?

8. The specific names included under *Gryphaea* in this work are listed below. Three are *nomina nuda* ; the identity of the remainder rests on figures in older works. Since no diagnoses are given, no specimens preserved in the Lamarckian

Collection or in any collections known to have been studied by Lamarck can be accepted as the type specimens of these species.

(*i*) *Gryphaea angulata*. No references to figures are given. The name is a *nomen nudum*.

(*ii*) *Gryphaea suborbiculata*. The references are to " Knorr. Petrif. vol. 2, part. 1, pl. 62. Encyclop. pl. 189, f. 3, 4 ". Lamarck's references to Knorr are not bibliographically correct, as he renumbered Knorr's plates owing to the peculiarity of Knorr's original system of numbering. The plate referred to is that numbered " D.III c ", and can be identified by counting the plates from the beginning. *G. suborbiculata*, identified both by the figure in this plate and those of the *Encyclopédie méthodique* cited by Lamarck, is a well-known Upper Cretaceous species. Lamarck later re-named it *Gryphaea columba* and it is now referred to the genus *Exogyra* Say, 1820.

(*iii*) *Gryphaea cymbula*. The reference given is " Knorr. Petrif. vol. 2, part. 1, pl. 20, f. 7." The plate number should read " B. I. d ", in which fig. 7 shows the profile view of a large Jurassic *Gryphaea*. This appears to be a well-known Middle Liassic species, although Rollier (1915, *Fossiles nouveaux ou peu connus* : 571) considers that it cannot be identified with certainty.

(*iv*) *Gryphaea arcuata*. The references are " Encyclop. pl. 189, f. 1, 2. Knorr. Petrif. vol. 2, p. 1, pl. 60, f. 1, 2. Bourg. Petrif. no. 92." This species needs careful consideration, and it seems desirable to fix its identity by selecting as lectotype the original of the most appropriate of the figures cited. The *Encyclopédie méthodique* figures were later omitted by Lamarck (1819, *Hist. nat. Anim. sans Vertèbr.* **6** (1) : 198) from those cited under *G. arcuata* and included under *G. cymbium*. The reference to Knorr has the objection that the plate cited should read " D. III a " (not 60). Knorr gave no localities for the specimens represented in figs. 1, 2 of this plate, but there is little doubt that fig. 1, at least, is of a specimen from the Lower Lias closely resembling that described by J. Sowerby in 1815 as *Gryphaea incurva*. Fig. 92 (on pl. xv) of Bourguet's *Traité de Pétrifications* (the third work cited by Lamarck) is of a very similar shell which undoubtedly came from the Lower Lias, although again no locality is given. Bourguet's figured specimen is hereby selected as the lectotype of *G. arcuata*.

So great, however, are the difficulties of specific identification in Liassic Gryphaeas, that it might be contended that a single figure, however good, of a specimen of unknown provenance is insufficient for subsequent recognition of a species. Some workers would, in fact, maintain that a species of this group could be identified only if its precise locality and geological horizon were known, or, alternatively, a large series of specimens from the same bed available for statistical examination. Schädle (1929, *Geol. paläont. Abh.* (n.s.) **17**(2) : 26, pl.

2 figs. 7-17 ; pl. 3, figs. 1-4, 9), the latest reviser of Liassic oysters as a whole, however, regards *G. arcuata* as a species of moderately long geological range and broad synonymy, and Bourguet's figured specimen was undoubtedly a fully representative specimen of the species as conceived of by this author. Schäfle's pl. 2, fig. 7, compares closely with Bourguet's figure, as does his pl. 2, fig. 16 with Knorr's pl. D. III a, fig. 1. Bouguet's figure of the specimen which is now selected as lectotype, together with Knorr's fig. 1, are, therefore, sufficient to establish the identity of *G. arcuata* as interpreted by Schäfle, whose work, although not statistical, is as thorough as that of any other modern author.

(*v*) *Gryphaea africana*. Lamarck's reference is " Encyclop. pl. 189, f. 5, 6 ". These figures represent a well-characterized species which is abundant in the Cenomanian of Northern Africa and the Middle East and is now referred to *Exogyra* Say.

(*vi*) *Gryphaea carinata*. The reference given by Lamarck is " Bourg. Petrif. pl. 15, f. 89, 90." There is some doubt as to which of several Cretaceous species of *Exogyra* is represented by these figures. The name *G. carinata* has not been generally adopted.

(*vii*) *Gryphaea latissima*. Lamarck's reference is " Bourg. Petrif. pl. 14, no. 84, 85." This is the well-known Lower Cretaceous *Exogyra* to which the later names *couloni* (Defrance) and *sinuata* (J. Sowerby) have more frequently been applied.

(*viii*) *Gryphaea depressa*. A *nomen nudum*.

(*ix*) *Gryphaea angustata*. A *nomen nudum*.

9. From the above, it may be seen that, besides *G. arcuata*, three species of unquestionable identity (*G. suborbiculata*, *G. africana*, *G. latissima*), all now included in *Exogyra*, were available for selection as the type species of *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, together with two of doubtful identity (*G. cymbula*, *G. carinata*).

(*d*) Is Anton's selection of " G. arcuata " as type species of " Gryphaea " Lamarck without technical objections?

10. On. pl. vi. of the preface to his *Verzeichniss* (1839) Anton refers to " Gattungen (deren Typusart mit Versalbuchstaben gedruckt ist) " and on p. 21 *arcuata* is the only species printed in small capitals under " Untergattung *Gryphaea* Lam." Throughout the work the type species of genera and subgenera are consistently indicated in this manner, and there seems to be no technical objection to this method of type selection. It is reasonable to maintain that a type selection for *Gryphaea* Lamarck without mention of the date of publication of the genus must be accepted as referring to its earliest place of publication.

11. So far as I know, none of the other species available from the *Système* has ever been cited as the type species of *Gryphaea*.

(e) Is there evidence that it was Lamarck's intention to found the genus " Gryphaea " primarily upon the living species " G. angulata "?

12. Monsieur Ranson argues that such was Lamarck's intention, as *G. angulata* was the first species listed by him under *Gryphaea* both in 1801 and in 1819. The generic diagnosis, however, states " crochet . . . courbé en spirale involute ", whereas the umbonal region in *G. angulata* is not involute, but coiled in a posterior direction, as in *Exogyra*. It further states " animal inconnu ", again suggesting that it was not the living European species that Lamarck had primarily in mind when writing the diagnosis. The actual generic name, moreover, was derived from the word " gryphites ", which had long been applied to the fossil forms in non-binominal literature.

(f) Does it seem desirable, to preserve current usage, for the International Commission to designate " G. angulata " Lamarck, 1819 as type species of " Gryphaea " under its plenary powers?

13. The generic name *Gryphaea* has been employed for the group of incoiled fossil oysters from Jurassic deposits in countless text-books and general works for the past 125 years. Since 1885, when P. Fischer (*Manuel de Conchyliologie* : 927) cited *G. angulata* as an example of *Gryphaea* and proposed the new name *Liogryphaea* for *G. arcuata* (although he referred this species to *Gryphaea* in the explanation of his text-figure), the name *Liogryphaea* has become fairly current in French palaeontological literature, although it has gained little ground in other countries. In my card index of Jurassic lamellibranchia extracted from the palaeontological literature of the whole world I have 1002 references under *Gryphaea* and 51 under *Liogryphaea*, whether as distinct genera or as subgenera of *Ostrea*. This shows that the name *Gryphaea* is about 20 times more familiar to palaeontologists as a whole than *Liogryphaea*. In fact, if *G. angulata* were the valid type species of *Gryphaea*, there would be a strong case for the use of the plenary powers with a view to legalizing the use of this generic name for the fossil forms. Similar figures for the name of the Portuguese Oyster are not available. Except in France, however, this is usually known as *Ostrea angulata* Lamarck, the necessity for its generic separation from *Ostrea* not being generally admitted. It was catalogued as *Ostrea* (*Crassostrea*) *angulata* by the late Mr. R. Winckworth in his " List of the Marine Mollusca of the British Isles " (1932, *J. Conchol.* **19** : 240).

Conclusions

14. In the light of the foregoing considerations, it is evident (1) that, under the *Règles*, Lamarck's *Système* is an available work for the purposes of Article 25 (the Law of Priority) (the observations in regard to that work contained in the Commission's *Opinion* 78 relating to an entirely different question, namely whether the method of citing specific names there adopted constitutes the selection, under Article 30, of the species so cited as the type species of the genera in which those species are severally placed), (2) that the specific name *Gryphaea angulata*, as cited in the *Système* is a *nomen nudum* and in consequence that the species validly so named by Lamarck eighteen years later (in 1819) is ineligible for selection as the type species of *Gryphaea*

Lamarck, 1801, (3) that of the described species included in *Gryphaea* in 1801 the first to be selected by any worker (Anton, 1839) as the type species of that genus was the fossil species *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck, 1801, (4) that in palaeontological literature the name *Gryphaea* is firmly established as the name of the genus containing the Liassic species *Gryphaea arcuata*, that genus having been called by that name about twenty times as often as by the name *Liogryphaea* Fischer, 1885, (*Man. Conch.*: 927), the name which that genus would bear, if *G. angulata* Lamarck, 1819, and not *G. arcuata* Lamarck, 1801, were the type species of *Gryphaea*, while it is only by French workers that the name *Gryphaea* has been habitually used for *G. angulata*, workers in other countries generally retaining that species in the genus *Ostrea* Linnaeus, 1758.

15. While I differ from Monsieur Ranson on the question of the species which, under the *Règles*, is the type species of the genus *Gryphaea*, I welcome his action in bringing this matter before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, for it is clearly desirable that a final decision on this matter should be obtained as soon as possible and an end thus put to the fruitless discussions which have been in progress for over sixty years. Before I formulate the action which I recommend that the International Commission should now take, in order finally to determine the type species of the genus *Gryphaea*, I must refer briefly to another question, which, though entirely unconnected with the question of the type species of this genus, has nevertheless a bearing on the action which it is desirable that the Commission should now take. I refer to the question whether the trivial name *arcuata* Lamarck, 1801 (as published in the binominal combination *Gryphaea arcuata*) is the oldest available name for the species which is the type species of the genus *Gryphaea*. The name *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck, 1801, is an available name both in the sense that it is not a junior homonym of any previously published specific name and in the sense that it is not a junior objective synonym of an earlier name applied to the same species. There is, however, an earlier name, which has hitherto been treated by almost all authors as a *nomen dubium*, which may have been based upon specimens of the same species as that upon which the nominal species *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck, 1801 (as defined by the lectotype selection made in paragraph 8(iv) above) was based. This nominal species is *Anomia gryphus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 701), which was based upon a short diagnosis (which cannot be interpreted with certainty) and upon references to five older works, none of which, it may be noted, was among those similarly cited by Lamarck when publishing the name *Gryphaea arcuata*, though some illustrate that species, as here interpreted. Hanley (1855, *Ipsa Linn. Conch.*: 124), it is true, recorded that the Linnean Collection includes a worn *Gryphaea* bearing the number 192 (under which Linnaeus listed *Anomia gryphus* in 1758) and that this appears to belong, not to *G. arcuata*, but to the related species *G. obliquata* Sowerby (J.), 1815 (*Min. Conch.* **2** : 24). Nevertheless, this specimen could not be accepted as more than a syntype of the Linnean species. Thus, the trivial name *gryphus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Anomia gryphus*) constitutes a potential threat to the stability of the name of one or other of the two species now known as *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck and *Gryphaea obliquata* Sowerby (J.). The possibility that a well-established name (such as the trivial name *arcuata* Lamarck, 1801, or the trivial name

obliquata Sowerby (J.), 1815) might be threatened by some older *nomen dubium* (such as the trivial name *gryphus* Linnaeus, 1758) has been anticipated by the International Commission and by the International Congress of Zoology, and the latter body, on the recommendation of the Commission, has inserted in Article 31 a provision that in such a case the question at issue is to be referred to the Commission for decision (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 76). It is in pursuance of that provision that this case is now reported to the International Commission. It cannot possibly be established that the trivial name *gryphus* Linnaeus, 1758, certainly applies to the same species as the name *arcuata* Lamarck, 1801, and the continued existence of this name as an available name serves no useful purpose whatever, constituting only a threat to the stability of the names *arcuata* Lamarck and *obliquata* Sowerby (J.). The International Commission is accordingly asked to remove that threat by using its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *gryphus* Linnaeus.

Recommendations

16. I accordingly ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to reject the arguments regarding the type species of the genus *Gryphaea* advanced by Monsieur Ranson, and :—

(1) to rule that, under Article 25 of the *Règles*, the generic name *Gryphaea* possesses availability for the purposes of the Law of Priority as from the date of its publication in 1801 in the *Système* of Lamarck and that the type species of that genus is *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck, 1801, that species having been so selected by Anton (1839) and having been the first of the originally included species to have been so selected by any author ;

(2) to use its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *gryphus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Anomia gryphus*) for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(3) to place the generic name *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by selection by Anton (1839) : *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck, 1801) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;

(4) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *arcuata* Lamarck, 1801 (as published in the binominal combination *Gryphaea arcuata*), the species so named to be defined by the lectotype selection made in the present application (trivial name of type species of *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801) ;

(*b*) *obliquata* Sowerby (J.), 1815 (as published in the binominal combination *Gryphaea obliquata*) ;

(*c*) *angulata* Lamarck, 1819 (as published in the binominal combination *Gryphaea angulata*) ;

(5) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *Liogryphaea* Fischer, 1885 (a junior objective synonym of *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, the two nominal genera having the same species as type species) ;

(*b*) *Liogryphea* Douvillé, 1904 (*Miss. sci. Pers.* **3** (Études géol.)(4) (Pal.) : 273) (an invalid variation of *Liogryphaea* Fischer, 1885) ;

(6) to place the trivial name *gryphus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Anomia gryphus*), as proposed, under (2) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSAL THAT "GRYPHAEA ANGULATA" LAMARCK, 1819 (CLASS PELECYPODA) SHOULD BE DESIGNATED AS THE TYPE SPECIES OF THE GENUS "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1819, BY THE SUPPRESSION OF THE NAME "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1801

By W. J. ARKELL, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.
(*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Extract from a letter dated 3rd June, 1951)

I disapprove of this application and consider that the Rules should take their course. By so doing, they legalise the current and past practice in what I believe to be the overwhelming majority of literature in which the name *Gryphaea* has been mentioned. I can recall no exception in the whole of palaeontological literature to the assumption that the type species of *Gryphaea* is a Liassic species. Moreover, the work on programme evolution that has made *Gryphaea* a household word has so widely disseminated the name in biological literature generally that I cannot understand even a neontologist wanting to change the type species.

OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED ACCEPTANCE OF "GRYPHAEA ANGULATA" LAMARCK, 1819, AS THE TYPE SPECIES OF THE GENUS "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1819 (CLASS PELECYPODA): COMMENT ON PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY M. GILBERT RANSON

By MYRA KEEN (*Curator of Paleontology*) and SIEMON W. MULLER (*Professor of Geology, Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Letter dated 29th May, 1951)

We strongly disapprove the proposal that *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, should be suppressed under the plenary powers of the International Commission. We see no compelling reason why this should be done, and, in our opinion, such action would result in much confusion.

Surveying the literature, we observe that even those authors of the past who have accepted *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck, 1819, as the type species of the genus *Gryphaea* have included *G. arcuata* Lamarck, 1801, in their concept of the genus; and hence, the name is much more widely established in paleontological literature than it is in the literature on Recent forms. The term *Crassostrea* Sacco, 1898 (*in* Bellardi & Sacco, *Moll. Terr. terz. Piemonte e Liguria* : 23 : 15) is available for use in the Recent group—in fact is used by many modern authors. Therefore, we feel that nothing is to be gained and much is to be lost in adopting the proposal, for it means shifting the concept of the genus. If by the proposed ruling, a name were to be protected, the case would be different. This change would merely render obsolete a large body of literature in order to provide a given name for a given type species. Much simpler would be the erection of a new generic group if Monsieur Ranson feels that *Crassostrea* is inappropriate for the restricted group represented by *Gryphaea angulata*.

The problem has been discussed by the paleontologists Dall (1898, *Trans Wagner Free Inst. Sci. Philad.* **3** (4) : 672-675), Hertlein (1933, *Trans. San Diego Soc. nat. Hist.* **7** (22) : 277-278) and Stenzel (1947, "Nomenclatural Synopsis of supraspecific groups of the family Ostreidae", *J. Paleont.* **21** (2) : 165-185, especially page 175), all of whom have come to the conclusion that the type species of *Gryphaea* should be *G. arcuata* Lamarck, 1801. The reasons which they and also the late Mr. R. Winckworth have advanced seem to us cogent.

OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED ACCEPTANCE OF "GRYPHAEA ANGULATA" LAMARCK, 1819, AS THE TYPE SPECIES OF THE GENUS "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1801 (CLASS PELECYPODA): COMMENT ON PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY M. GILBERT RANSON

By D. T. DONOVAN, B.Sc., Ph.D.
(*University of Bristol, Department of Geology, Bristol*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Extract from a letter dated 8th June, 1951)

Gryphaea arcuata Lamarck, 1801, the type species of *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801, and other species of the same genus, are common and familiar fossils in rocks of Lower Lias age, and have been known almost exclusively by this generic name since the time of Lamarck's work. I realise that the living species, *Gryphaea angulata* Lamarck, 1819, the Portuguese Oyster, is very well known to students of recent molluscs, but, even if it is as familiar to them as the fossil species *Gryphaea arcuata* Lamarck is to palaeontologists, the use of the plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* where they operate to give a perfectly unambiguous result would seem highly undesirable, and only to be recommended if the combination *Gryphaea arcuata* had for long fallen out of use, which is most emphatically not the case.

SUPPORT FOR DR. L. R. COX'S PROPOSAL FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE NAME "CARDINIA" (CLASS LAMELLIBRANCHIATA) AS FROM AGASSIZ [1841]

By W. J. ARKELL, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.
(*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)208)

(Extract from a letter dated 3rd June, 1951)

With reference to Dr. L. R. Cox's application for the use of the plenary powers to validate the generic name *Cardinia* as from Agassiz [1841] (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 59-64), I agree with this application and wish to support it.

SUPPORT FOR DR. HENNING LEMCHE'S PROPOSALS RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "SCAPHANDER" MONTFORT, 1810 (CLASS GASTROPODA)

By JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.
(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)378)

(Extract from a letter dated 22nd June, 1951)

The name *Scaphander* should, in my opinion, be placed on the *Official List* as requested, for the very convincing reasons given by Dr. Henning Lemche in his application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature[3].

[3] See 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2**: 35-36.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DR. W. K. ARKELL IN REGARD TO THE GENERIC NAMES "AMMONITES," "ARNIOCERAS" AND "LIPAROCERAS" AND THE TRIVIAL NAME "ANGULATUS" SCHLOTHEIM, 1820 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "AMMONITES ANGULATUS") (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

By D. T. DONOVAN, B.Sc., Ph.D.

(*Bristol University, Department of Geology, Bristol*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)425, 509, 507, 422)

(Extract from a letter dated 28th May, 1951)

I write to comment on certain of the applications submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by Dr. W. J. Arkell and published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, vol. 2, Parts 6/8.

I have been specialising in Liassic Ammonites for several years and have just completed an account of certain of them, while I am preparing revisions of two old monographs, namely Thomas Wright's "Monograph on the Lias Ammonites of the British Islands" and Pierre Reynes' "Monographie des Ammonites." Consequently, I am directly concerned with the effects of some of Dr. Arkell's proposals.

(1) *Page* 200. *Generic name* Ammonites *Bruguière* (Z.N.(S.)425) :—

I agree with Dr. Arkell that it is undesirable for this name to remain, as at present, based on an eighteenth-century figure of uncertain identity, owing to the possibility of different interpretations, as pointed out in paragraph 11 of the proposal. The alternative procedure, namely the definition of the type species by reference to a later figure is liable to displace other current names ; as regards the particular proposal mentioned by Dr. Arkell (paragraph 13(A)) that d'Orbigny's 1843 plate 43 should be selected as "neotype" of *Ammonites bisulcatus*, Bruguière, I have personally examined d'Orbigny's collection at Paris and have satisfied myself that his plate 43 does not represent any now existing specimen ; it may be a figure of a lost specimen but is more likely to be an idealised drawing. It is therefore undesirable that the interpretation of any genus should depend on this figure. In my own work I have not used the genus, since it cannot be defined to the agreement of all, and I feel that Dr. Arkell's proposal for suppression would be an acceptable solution.

(2) *Page* 204. *The trivial name* angulatus *Schlotheim* (*as published in the binominal combination* Ammonites angulatus) (Z.N.(S.)422) :—

I agree with the proposal to suppress the trivial name *angulatus* Sowerby, 1815 (as published in the binominal combination *Ammonites angulatus*) in favour of *angulatus* Schlotheim, 1820 (as published in the same binominal combination), as it will bring the legal position into line with universal usage. Any possible doubt as to the identity of Schlotheim's species has been removed since Dr. Arkell's paragraphs 10-12 were written, by the publication of type

material by Lange (1951, *Palaeontographica* **100** (Abt 1): pl. 1, fig. 2 (lectotype), also fig. 6 and pl. 2, fig. 13).

(3) *Page* 217. *Type species of* Arnioceras *Hyatt*, 1867 (Z.N.(S.)509) :—

(4) *Page* 220. *Type species of* Liparoceras *Hyatt*, 1867 (Z.N.(S.)507) :—

I agree with Dr. Arkell's proposals for the type species of these genera.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY DR. W. J. ARKELL THAT THE GENERIC NAME " AMMONITES " BRUGUIÈRE, 1789 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA) SHOULD BE SUPPRESSED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

By C. W. WRIGHT (*London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)425)

(Extract from a letter dated 17th July, 1951)

I should like to support Dr. W. J. Arkell's application (1951, *Bull. zools Nomencl.* **2**: 200-203) for the suppression of the generic name *Ammonite.* Bruguière, 1789. Although it might be argued that this name is comparable in its double connotation, as the name of a genus and, almost in the vernacular, as the name of an Order or Sub-Order, to such names as *Nautilus*, the scale of the vernacular use of *Ammonites* is so vast that its use as the name of a nominal genus would be bound to be confusing and misleading, quite apart from the arguments adduced by Dr. Arkell.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY DR. W. J. ARKELL FOR THE SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF FIVE EARLY NAMES FOR GENERA OF AMMONITES (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

By C. W. WRIGHT (*London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)423)

(Extract from a letter dated 17th July, 1951)

As a worker in Cretaceous ammonites, I am writing to support strongly Dr. W. J. Arkell's application (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 198-199) for the suppression of the five early names of ammonite genera, *Planulites* and *Orbulites* Lamarck, 1801, *Pelagus* and *Ellipsolithes* Montfort, 1808, and *Globites* de Haan, 1825. As he says, these names constitute a menace to ammonite nomenclature and that menace should be removed.

ON THE QUESTION WHETHER THE GENERIC NAME "ARIETICERAS" QUENSTEDT, 1883 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA) IS AN AVAILABLE NAME: COMMENT ON THE VIEW EXPRESSED BY DR. W. J. ARKELL

By H. ENGEL

(*Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)486)

(Extract from a letter dated 7th May, 1951)

The question in regard to the availability of Quenstedt's generic name *Arieticeras* raised by Dr. W. J. Arkell (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 208-210) and commented on by yourself (*ibid.* **2** : 211-213) as of general interest is a psychological one. My conclusion is that Dr. Arkell is not right in concluding that Quenstedt did not intend it as a new name. If he had thought it unnecessary, he could have stated that perhaps a new name might be required to distinguish the species in question but have given no name. The fact, however, that he did give a new name implies that he supposed that someone might think it necessary to give the species a new generic name and, providing for that case, he supplied a name. Though he decided for practical purposes not to use that name, he clearly gave it, to meet a future situation in which it might be considered necessary. Why else did he actually compose that name ? If one could ask Quenstedt, he would, I feel sure, be dissatisfied if his name were not to be regarded as available.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSALS RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "PLEUROCERA" RAFINESQUE, 1818 (CLASS GASTROPODA) SET FORTH IN THE REPORT SUBMITTED BY THE SECRETARY TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

By JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.
(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)83)

(Extract from a letter dated 22nd June, 1951)

I am in complete agreement with the recommendations in regard to the generic name *Pleurocera* Rafinesque, 1818 (Class Gastropoda) which you suggest in your Report to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2**: 6-17), and for the same reasons which you have so ably formulated. I find, however, that I cannot agree with Dr. Rehder's statement on p. 12 par. 3 (4). My feeling is that in formulating rules it is quite impossible to foresee all the possible contingencies that the rules will have to meet, and that if suspension is kept at a minimum, it will be necessary to alter the rules from time to time, increasing their complexity and also the difficulty of understanding them and applying them. The best way to achieve stability is to get the important names on to the *Official List*, and *Pleurocera* is a very important name, even if the genus it designates is a small one. If placing it on the *Official List* for use in its accepted sense involves suspension of rules, then by all means let the rules be suspended.

SUPPORT FOR DR. W. E. CHINA'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE TYPE SPECIES OF THE GENUS "CAPSUS" FABRICIUS, 1803 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA)

By S. v. KÉLER
(*Chief of the Hemiptera Department, Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)211)

(Letter dated 18th May, 1951)

Nach Kenntnisnahme und Ueberprüfung der Belange zu dem im 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2**(4)S. 103-104, veröffentlichten Antrag von W. E. China über die Bestimmung von *Cimex ater* Linnaeus, 1758, als Typus der Gattung *Capsus* Fabricius, 1803, erkläre ich, dass ich den Antrag in allen Punkten unterstütze.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY PROFESSOR HAROLD E. VOKES RELATING TO THE ENTRY OF THE NAME "MYTILUS" LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS PELECYPODA) ON THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY"

By JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.
(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)193)

(Extract from a letter dated 22nd June, 1951)

Since the names *Mytilus* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Anodonta* Lamarck, 1801, with their respective type species, are already on the *Official List*, I fail to see that any further action should be needed to stabilize them but, if such action is necessary, I should certainly support it. I would, however, like in this connection to call attention to the following point not mentioned in the application (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 31-32). Schumacher, in his *Essai nouv. Syst. Vers. test.* of 1817, also figured the hinge of *Arca* Linnaeus as a type selection and the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in fixing the type of *Arca*, discarded Schumacher's selection. I have not seen Schumacher's *Essai*, but Dr. H. A. Rehder, who has consulted it for me, tells me that the types of *Arca* and of *Mytilus* are selected in exactly the same way, from which I conclude that the discarding of the type selection of *Arca* automatically implies the discarding of the type species of *Mytilus* as well, and that therefore the earliest available type selection for *Mytilus* is that of Anton, and that *Mytilus edulis* is the type whether the rules are suspended or not.

The names *Mytilus* and *Anodonta* were placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* before the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names* was established. I believe, therefore, that the names *edulis* Linnaeus, 1758, and *cygneus* Linnaeus, 1758, as originally published as *Mytilus edulis* and *Mytilus cygneus*, are not on the latter *List*. I would accordingly suggest that these specific trivial names be now added to the *Official List*.

SUPPORT FOR THE RETENTION OF THE GENERIC NAMES "CRANGON" WEBER, 1795, AND "CRAGO" LAMARCK, 1801 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA): OBJECTION TO PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS

By WALDO L. SCHMITT

(*Smithsonian Institution, U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)231)

(Letter dated 30th November, 1950)

I am still hoping that there may be an opportunity for the weight of opinion to insure the retention of the use of *Crangon* Weber for *Alpheus* and *Crago* Lamarck for the genus formerly known as *Crangon*. I was much impressed by a survey made by Dr. Chace as long ago as 20th October.[4] It bears out my opinion of the feelings of the majority of the carcinologists and especially of American workers. Taxonomists have been accused of never being happy unless they could change names, but in this case a majority opinion should have some weight.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS REGARDING THE NAMES "CRANGON" FABRICIUS, 1798, AND "ALPHEUS" FABRICIUS, 1798 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)

By MARIE V. LEBOUR, D.Sc.

(*The Laboratory, Citadel Hill, Plymouth, England*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)231)

(Letter dated 4th July, 1951)

I have just received a paper from Dr. L. B. Holthuis of Leiden (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2**: 69-72) on the proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the generic name *Crangon* Fabricius, 1798, for the Common Shrimp and the generic name *Alpheus* Fabricius, 1798, for the Snapping Shrimps (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), and I wish to state that I heartily agree with his views.

[4] For Dr. Chace's survey here referred to, see pp. 76-78.

OBJECTION TO DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS' PROPOSALS RELATING TO THE NAMES "CRANGON" FABRICIUS, 1798, AND "ALPHEUS" FABRICIUS, 1798 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)

By FRANK A. MCNEILL

(*Australian Museum, Sydney, New South Wales*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)231)

(Extract from a letter dated 2nd January, 1951)

My American colleague, Fenner A. Chace, Jr., has written me and given details of Dr. L. B. Holthuis' application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. He also included in his letter a copy of the case he prepared and submitted to you for the consideration of the Commission.

Dr. Chace's case is presented in a fair and logical way. It is in complete agreement with my views on the matter and in accordance with modern accepted usage. There are, however, one or two points that I would like to contribute to the discussion. First, I have always been an adherent to the golden rule of priority; this is one of the foundation stones of our taxonomic science today. At times a worker must find it a nuisance, but no amount of argument can get around the right of an earlier accepted author's claim to recognition. The law of priority has been clearly set out by the Commission and it would surely lose in standing and confidence if it started now to make exceptions.

This "*Alpheus—Crangon* issue" has a classical parallel in taxonomy. I refer to Alcock's impassioned appeal for the retention of *Gelasimus* (Fiddler Crabs) as against the prior name *Uca*. In any consideration on the question under discussion this appeal of Alcock's should be carefully considered by the Commission; the reference is: 1900, *J. asiat. Soc. Bengal* (Pt. 2) **69**(3): 350. Every carcinologist today knows that this was a lost cause, for it is a rarity for the old name *Gelasimus* to appear in modern literature.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS REGARDING THE NAMES "CRANGON" FABRICIUS, 1798, AND "ALPHEUS" FABRICIUS, 1798 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)

By A. B. NEEDLER

(*Fisheries Research Board of Canada, Atlantic Biological Station, St. Andrews, N.B., Canada*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)231)

(Letter dated 5th July, 1951)

I have received a copy of Dr. L. B. Holthuis' application (Z.N.(S.)231) to validate the generic names *Alpheus* Fabricius, 1798, and *Crangon* Fabricius, 1798, and I should like to support it. In common with most Americans and Canadians, I have been using *Crangon* Weber, 1795, and *Crago* Lamarck, 1801, for these genera, but this practice leads to many muddles and should be abandoned.

À PROPOS DE LA PROPOSITION DU DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS AU SUJET DES NOMS GÉNÉRIQUES "CRANGON" WEBER, 1795 "CRANGON" FABRICIUS, 1798 ET "ALPHEUS" FABRICIUS, 1798

par H. NOUVEL

(*Faculté des Sciences de Toulouse, France*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)231)

Au cours d'une conversation avec le Dr. L. B. Holthuis et alors que je lui faisais part de ce qu'à mon avis, la stricte application des *Règles Internationales de Nomenclature* pouvait avoir d'irritant et de néfaste dans certains cas particuliers, à l'appui de mon opinion, je citais le famaux exemple "*Crangon-Crago-Alpheus.*" J'ajoutais que l'initiative de Rathbun était le plus bel exemple de ce qu'un spécialiste *ne devait pas faire*. Je lui disais aussi que personnellement, j'avais découvert des cas semblables au cours de mes recherches bibliographiques mais je me faisais un *devoir* de ne pas les dévoiler. C'est seulement après cette déclaration que le Dr. Holthuis m'a fait part de sa proposition relativement à ce cas précis.

Il me paraît intutile de reprendre les arguments fort pertinents de MM. Holthuis et Gurney. Je voudrais seulement insister sur l'argument de *bon sens*.

Pour ce qui concerne la Crevette la plus commune des côtes européennes, qui est aussi celle qui a été le plus souvent nommée dans la littérature et qui de plus, est le type du genre, aussi bien les Carcinologistes que les Zoologistes non spécialities, les Physiologistes, les Biologistes, les Economistes ont employé les noms de *Crangon crangon* ou de *Crangon vulgaris*. C'est aussi celui qu'on trouve dans les traités classiques et les ouvrages de faunistique et de détermination. Dans ces conditions, il se passerait bien des années avant que l'on puisse faire admettre l'usage du nom générique " *Crago*," si l'on songe qu'un demi-siècle d'usage n'a pu faire abandonner " *Crangon vulgaris* " !

Je n'ignore pas que l'argument joue en sens inverse, en Amérique, pour *Crago semtemspinosus*, mais la littérature relative à cette espèce est bien moins considérable, moins étalée dans le temps, moins " classique " que celle de *Crangon crangon*.

Pour ce qui concerne le rejet d' "Alpheus," je me contenterai de dire qu'en Europe et dans la plus grande partie du monde, et en dehors de quelques carcinologistes professionnels, il est fort peu de Zoologistes (s'il en est !) qui songent à un *Alpheidae* lorsque l'on parle de " *Crangon*," même en y associant le nom de Weber !

Je voudrais enfin joindre un argument d'ordre psychologique. En Europe, tout au moins, les usagers qui ne sont pas des taxonomistes professionnels sont, à juste titre, lassés par les continuelles et fréquentes modifications de nomenclature qui leur apparaissent bien souvent comme une activité scientifique stérile, désagréable et même néfaste. Il faut bien reconnaître que la est l'origine du discrédit qui frappe les systématiciens dans l'esprit de beaucoup de Biologistes et de Physiologistes. Je pense, à l'encontre de M. Chace, que l'avis des Biologistes qui ne sont pas des Carcinologistes taxonomistes professionnels et actifs est loin d'être négligeable.

Donc chaque fois que l'application des *Règles* ne s'impose réellement pas, je pense qu'il faut opter pour la solution qui apporte le minimum de perturbations. C'est pourquoi je suis fermement partisan de la solution proposée par le Dr. L. B. Holthuis.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS IN REGARD TO THE GENERIC NAMES "CRANGON," "LIGIA," "SCYLLARIDES," "LYSIOSQUILLA" AND "ODONTODACTYLUS" (CLASS CRUSTACEA)

By HEINRICH BALSS

(*Hauptkonservator der Zoologischen Staatssammlung, München, a D., Germany*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)231, 209, 473, 474, 475)

(Letter dated 6th July, 1951)

Mr. L. B. Holthuis hat mir eine Reihe von Anträgen an die internationale Nomenklaturkommission zugesandt (Commission's references Z.N.(S.)231[5] (*Crangon*), 209[6] (*Ligia*), 473[7] (*Scyllarides*), 474[8] (*Lysiosquilla*), 475[9] (*Odontodactylus*)).

Ich erlaube mir, Ihnen mitzuteilen, dass ich mit allen seinen Vorschlägen einverstanden bin.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS IN REGARD TO THE GENERIC NAMES "CRANGON," "LIGIA," "SCYLLARIDES,' "LYSIOSQUILLA," AND "ODONTODACTYLUS" (CLASS CRUSTACEA)

By E. SOLLAUD

(*Université de Lyon, Faculté des Sciences, Lyon*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)231, 209, 473, 474, 475)

(Letter dated 11th July 1951)

Je reçois de mon collègue et ami Mr. Holthuis, du Museum de Leide, cinq notes relative à des propositions faites à l'International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature au sujet d'un certain nombre de noms de genres de Crustacés (Commission's references Z.N.(S.)231[5] (*Crangon*), 209[6] (*Ligia*), 473[7] (*Scyllarides*), 474[8] (*Lysiosquilla*), 475[9] (*Odontodactylus*).

Je vous informe que, après avoir lu attentivement ces notes, j'approuve entièrement les propositions de Mr. Holthuis. J'estime qu'une application rigoureuse, en toutes circonstances, du loi de priorité conduirait a d'inextricables confusions et, bien loin de servir notre science, lui serait tres préjudiciable. Il est impossible d'abandonner de noms tels que *Ligia*, *Crangon*, *Alpheus*, . . ., qui sont passés dans le langage courant, et votre Commission fera oeuvre bien utile en freinant l'ardeur des " puristes " de la Priorité.

---

[5] See Holthuis, 1951, *Bull zool. Nomencl.* **2**: 69-72.
[6] See Buitendijk & Holthuis, 1951, *ibid.* **2**: 99-101.
[7] See Holthuis, 1951, *ibid.* **2**: 81-82.
[8] See Holthuis, 1951, *ibid.* **2**: 83-84.
[9] See Holthuis, 1951, *ibid.* **2**: 86-87.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSALS RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "LIGIA" FABRICIUS, 1798 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA) AND ASSOCIATED PROBLEMS SUBMITTED BY THE LATE MISS M. BUITENDIJK AND DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS

By A. VANDEL

(*Laboratoire de Zoologie, Université de Toulouse, France*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)209)

(Extract from a letter dated 6th June, 1951)

Ligia. Entièrement d'accord avec feu Mlle. A. M. Buitendijk et M. L. B. Holthuis,[10] et Paul Heegard.—Il conviendrait seulement d'ajouter que cette question de nomenclature avait été déjà très nettement exposé et résolue dans le même sens par Fr. Dahl (1916, *Die Asseln oder Isopoden Deutschlands*, Jena : 32).

SUPPORT FOR PROFESSOR MUNRO FOX'S PROPOSAL THAT THE GENERIC NAME "MONOCULUS" LINNAEUS, 1758, SHOULD BE SUPPRESSED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

By JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.

(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)377)

(Extract from a letter dated 22nd June, 1951)

With reference to the application submitted by Professor H. Munro Fox (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 37-39), I am of the opinion that the generic name *Monoculus* Linnaeus, 1758, should be suppressed under the plenary powers before someone selects a type species for the genus so named, and, by doing so, upsets a long-established and universally understood name.

[10] See footnote 6.

REQUEST THAT THE NAME "DORYLAS," AN AMENDATION BY KERTESZ (1910) OF THE NAME "DORILAS" MEIGEN, 1800 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA), BE PLACED ON THE "OFFICIAL INDEX OF REJECTED AND INVALID GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY"

By D. ELMO HARDY

(*University of Hawaii, Department of Zoology and Entomology, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)221)

In my letter of 19th October 1950 (see 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 144-145) I expressed my strong dissent from the proposal submitted by Mr. William F. Rapp (*Doane College, Crete, Nebraska, U.S.A.*) that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should use its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing the generic name *Dorilas* Meigen, 1800, and thus conferring availability upon its junior synonym *Pipunculus* Latreille, [1802-1803]. I see that Dr. John Smart (*University of Cambridge, Department of Zoology, Cambridge*) has now submitted a formal application to the International Commission, setting out the action which he recommends that the International Commission should take to confer availability upon the name *Pipunculus* Latreille (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 148-149). In these circumstances it will, I think, be convenient if I formally submit a statement of the action which I ask the International Commission to take to make it clear that it is the name *Dorilas* Meigen, 1800, and not the name *Pipunculus* Latreille, [1802-1803], which is the correct name for the genus comprising the species *Pipunculus campestris* Latreille, [1802-1803], which is the type species of both these nominal genera.

Before making this formal submission, there is one matter connected with this case which has not been directly raised in any of the communications submitted to the International Commission, but on which is very desirable that a decision should be taken as part of any general settlement of this problem. I refer to the question of the spelling to be adopted for this Meigen name, namely whether the original spelling *Dorilas* should be used or whether the emendation *Dorylas* published by Kertesz in 1910 (*Cat. Dipt.* **7** : 368) should be used in its place. On this subject there are two considerations which I desire to lay before the Commission : First, it must be noted that, although the spelling *Dorylas* was frequently used in the literature, following the proposal put forward by Kertesz in 1910, that spelling has now for some time been completely replaced by the original spelling *Dorilas*, and confusion rather than uniformity would result if it were necessary now to revert to the discarded emendation *Dorylas*. Second, it may be noted that the spelling *Dorylas* has been used for a genus in the Order Coleoptera (*Dorylas* Dejean, 1835, *Cat. Coleopt.* (ed. 2) : 409). I accordingly ask that the Commission, when dealing with this case, should make it clear that it is the original spelling *Dorilas* and not the emended spelling *Dorylas* which should be used.

The proposal which, in continuation of my letter of 19th October 1950, I now submit is that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) place the generic name *Dorilas* Meigen, 1800 (type species, by designation by Coquillet (1910) : *Pipunculus campestris* Latreille, [1802-1803]) (gender of generic name : masculine) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;

(2) place the trivial name *campestris* Latreille, [1802-1803] (as published in the binominal combination *Pipunculus campestris*) (trivial name of type species of *Dorilas* Meigen, 1800) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;

(3) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(a) *Pipunculus* Latreille, [1802-1803] (an objective junior synonym of *Pipunculus* Latreille, [1802-1803], the two nominal genera having the same species as type species) ;

(b) *Dorylas* Kertesz, 1910 (an invalid emendation of *Dorilas* Meigen, 1800).

OBJECTION TO PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY PROFESSOR MARTIN L. ACZÉL IN FAVOUR OF THE ADDITION OF THE NAME " TYLOS " TO THE " OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY "

By A. VANDEL

(*Laboratoire de Zoologie, Université de Toulouse, France*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)501)

(Extracts from letters dated 6th June and 20th July, 1951)

(a) *Extract from a letter dated 6th June*, 1951

L'adoption de *Tylos* Meigen, 1800, proposée par Aczél (: 156) (mais rejeté par Smart : 158) aurait le grave inconvénient d'etablir une homonymie avec un genre bien connu d'Isopodes Oniscoïdes, *Tylos* Latreille, 1825 (*in* Audouin et Savigny).

(b) *Extract from a letter dated 20th July*, 1951

En parlant de " genre bien connu," je voulais simplement exprimer que depuis 1825 le terme de *Tylos* est adopté sans exception par tous les carcinologistes. Il serait trop long d'en donner la liste complète, mais une énumération importante a été donnée par : Stebbing (T.R.R.)—1910, " Reports on the Marine Biology of the Sudanese Red Sea " (*J. linn. Soc. Lond.* (Zool.) 31. Voir pp. 226-227).

Il serait bien fâcheux qu'un nom employé de façon constante depuis 125 ans fût rejeté.

COMMENTS ON THE APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE REGARDING THE GENERIC NAMES "TITANIA," "DORILAS," "TENDIPES," "PHILIA" AND "TYLOS" MEIGEN, 1800 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA)

By W. HENNIG

(*Deutsches Entomologisches Institut, Berlin*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)197, 221, 469, 498, 501)

(Letter dated 22nd May, 1951)

Asked by Professor E. M. Hering for a comment on the various proposals concerning the names of Dipterous genera (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, Vol. 2, Part 5) I wish to bring forward the following considerations :—

It is deeply to be regretted that the names of Meigen, 1800, were unearthed by Hendel (1908) and at that time every effort to suppress those names should have been supported.

Since, however, the suppression of the names of Meigen, 1800, *in toto* was rejected by *Opinion* 28, they were used in several fundamental publications such as Lindner's "Fliegen der paläarktischen Region" and other important revisionary works as pointed out by Aczél, Hardy, and Stone.

Every attempt to restore the names of Meigen, 1800, is, therefore, now 30 to 40 years too late and contributes to augmentation rather than diminution of confusion.

This is especially true in the case of the names *Tylos*, *Dorilas*, and also *Philia* and *Tendipes*, though for these latter two perhaps not quite to the same extent.

For this reason I fully agree with Aczél, Hardy, and Stone in the proposal to use the names *Tylos*, *Dorilas*, *Philia* and *Tandipes* instead of *Micropeza*, *Pipunculus*, *Dilophus*, and *Chironomus* respectively.

It is quite another situation with *Titania* versus *Chlorops*. *Titania* has never been used in recent publications. Its introduction in the place of the well-known and very important name *Chlorops* would lead, therefore, to considerable disadvantage and confusion, especially in the literature of economic entomology. I think that there will be general agreement in this case with the proposal of Dr. Sabrosky.

ON THE PROPOSAL THAT THE TRIVIAL NAME "AJAX" LINNAEUS, 1758 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "PAPILIO AJAX") SHOULD BE SUPPRESSED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE UNDER ITS PLENARY POWERS

By CYRIL F. DOS PASSOS, LL.B.

(*Research Associate, Department of Insects and Spiders, American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)192)

(Note dated 15th May, 1951)

1. Reference is made to two prior papers on this subject published by the late A. Steven Corbet (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** (1) : 26-29) and by Francis Hemming (*ibid.* **2** (1) : 29-30).

2. It having been ascertained by Corbet from an examination of the Linnean collection that the trivial name *ajax* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ajax*) was proposed for an Oriental species later named *Papilio xuthus* by Linnaeus in 1767, although never used for that insect, but by error having been applied by some authors to two Nearctic butterflies, the question arises whether it would be better (*a*) to suppress the name *ajax*, or (*b*) to apply it (incorrectly) by a suspension of the *Règles* to one of the Nearctic insects for which it has sometimes been used.

3. This problem involves the names of two Nearctic and one Oriental *Papilio*. I shall consider only the two former. One of these is a subspecies of *Papilio polyxenes* Fabricius, 1775, sometimes known as the common American on the Black (or Parsnip) Swallowtail, and the other is often referred to as *Papilio marcellus* Cramer, [1777], or the Papaw or Zebra Swallowtail. There has been considerable confusion as to which scientific names should be employed for these insects. Recent American authors have shown a tendency to abandon the name *ajax* for either of them, although one follows McDunnough (1938, " Check List of the Lepidoptera of Canada and the United States of America ". *Mem. S. Calif. Acad. Sci.* **1** : 5) and uses *ajax* for the first-mentioned butterfly. Holland (1931, *Butterfly Book* (revised ed.) : 314) used *asterius* for the subspecies of *polyxenes* inhabiting North America, and *ajax* for the more southerly Papaw or Zebra Swallowtail in direct contradiction to the then current Barnes & Benjamin list (1926, " Check List of the Lepidoptera of Boreal America ". *Bull. S. Calif. Acad. Sec.* **25**(1) : 5). Clark (1932, " Butterflies of the District of Columbia and vicinity ", *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* **157** : 191) used *asterias* for the Nearctic subspecies of *polyxenes* but *marcellus* Boisduval (*recte* Cramer) for the Papaw or Zebra Swallowtail and omitted *ajax* entirely. Macy and Shepard ([1941], *Butterflies, a Handbook of the butterflies of the United Sstates, complete for the Region north of the Potomac and Chio Rivers and east of the Dakotas* : iii) stated that " . . . In order to achieve uniformity, . . . " they followed the nomenclature of the McDunnough check list. Brown (1951, " The American Papilios ",

The Lepidopterists' News **4** : 63) also used *ajax* for the species *polyxenes*. Finally, Klots (1951, *A Field Guide to the butterflies of North America, east of the Great Plains* : 172) employed *asterius* Stoll, [1784], for the Nearctic subspecies *polyxenes* and omitted *ajax*, except that (erroneously) he placed *ajax* Clerck, 1764, in the synonymy.

4. Thus we find *ajax* in recent years used for two different species of Nearctic butterflies which have valid names, i.e. *asterius* and *marcellus*, and on top of that it is now descovered that *ajax* is not properly applicable to either of them. In view of the improper use of *ajax*, the lack of uniformity among American authors respecting the applicability of that name to one Nearctic species, and the fact that some authors have dropped the name entirely, no harm and much good would be done by the suppression of the name *ajax* and that course is undoubtedly the most desirable one to follow. Therefore, I recommend that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature take such action.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY THE LATE DR. A. STEVEN CORBET FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRIVIAL NAME "AJAX" LINNAEUS, 1758 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "PAPILIO AJAX") (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By ERICH MARTIN HERING

(*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität, Berlin*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)192)

(Letter dated 28th May, 1951)

There is no doubt that, under a strict application of the Rules, the trivial name *ajax* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Papilio ajax*) should be employed for the species generally known as *Papilio xuthus* Linnaeus, 1767. To prevent the confusion which would follow if *ajax* Linnaeus, 1758, were to replace *xuthus* Linnaeus, 1767, I propose that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should use its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *ajax* Linnaeus, 1758, altogether.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DETERMINE THE SPECIES TO WHICH THE TRIVIAL NAME "SIRTALIS" LINNAEUS, 1758 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "COLUBER SIRTALIS") (CLASS REPTILIA) IS TO BE APPLIED: SUPPORT FOR APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY DR. KARL P. SCHMIDT AND MR. ROGER CONANT

By LAURENCE M. KLAUBER
(San Diego, California, U.S.A.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)433)

(Letter dated 22nd May, 1951)

Reference is made to the above-mentioned case, discussed on pages 67-68, *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, vol. 2, Pt. 3, and the request for comments appearing in *Science*, vol. 113, p. 560. Messrs. Karl P. Schmidt and Roger Conant, in their original statement of the case to the Commission, list my name, among others, as being favourable to the change indicated as necessary under the Rules, in my paper published in *Copeia* in 1948. As a matter of fact, although the change was originally shown by me to be technically necessary, I am not in favour of the change, now that the Commission's plenary powers have been modified to include the conservation of trivial names. Therefore, I join with the majority of American herpetologists in recommending that the Commission direct the use of the trivial name *sirtalis* for the common garter snake, and of the trivial name *sauritus* for the northern ribbon snake.

The particularly confusing situation caused by the transference of the Linnean name *sirtalis* from one group of garter snakes (the common group) to another (the ribbon group), as demanded by the old Rules, does not exist in the case of the other necessary changes in Linnean names to which I called attention in 1948. The latter changes should stand.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY DR. KARL P. SCHMIDT AND MR. ROGER CONANT THAT THE TRIVIAL NAME "SIRTALIS" LINNAEUS, 1758 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "COLUBER SIRTALIS") (CLASS REPTILIA) SHOULD BE PRESERVED FOR USE IN ITS EXISTING SENSE UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

By MURRAY L. JOHNSON, M.D.
(*Tacoma, Washington, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)433)

(Letter dated 9th July, 1951)

Here is a good example where the International Commission may act to conserve order in a difficult enough species, taxonomically speaking. I have the highest regard for Dr. Lawrence Klauber and believe his scientific reasoning to be without question, but I take serious issue with the propriety of changing a well established name. I am very glad therefore to learn that in this case Dr. Klauber has notified his support for the use of the plenary powers to preserve the name *sirtalis* Linnaeus. The objections to discarding this name are very strong: The original Linnean specimens are not extant; the original Linnean description is certainly not adequate by modern standards and yet under the Code we should apply these modern standards retrospectively to identify the species described by Linnaeus. In as much as there are hundreds of articles and tens of thousands of catalogued specimens, entries on cards and in catalogues, I implore you to use your good offices permanently to stabilize this point of nomenclature. I feel very strongly that the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature should be suspended in the case of *Thamnophis sirtalis* (Linnaeus), to retain that name. The reasons put forward for the change are not adequate in modern taxonomy, in my opinion.

CONTENTS

(*continued from front wrapper*)

New Applications

Page

Request for a ruling that the distribution of a scientific paper in microfilm does not constitute "publication" for the purposes of Article 25 of the *Règles*. (1) application submitted jointly by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America and the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology; (2) comments on the foregoing by (a) the Committee on Nomenclature of the American Museum of Natural History, New York; (b) Dr. Charles H. Blake; (c) Professor E. H. Behre; (d) "Zoological Record" Committee of the Zoological Society of London.. 306-312

On Dr. L. R. Cox's proposal that S. A. Renier's "Prodromo" and the "Prospetto della Classe dei Vermi" should be declared not to have been published within the meaning of Article 25 of the *Règles*. By the late R. Winckworth (*London*) 312

Proposed use of the plenary powers to designate type species for the genera *Nysius* Dallas, 1852, and *Artheneis* Spinola, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera). (1) application by Professor R. L. Usinger and Dr. R. I. Sailer; (2) comments on the foregoing by Mr. Francis Hemming and Dr. W. E. China 313-318

Proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the entry on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the name *Limulus* Müller, 1785 (Class Merostomata) (proposed correction of an error in *Opinion* 104). (1) application by Professor Leif Størmer; (2) comments on the foregoing by (a) Professor H. Munro Fox; (b) Dr. Carl O. Dunbar 319-323

Comments on previously published applications

Gryphaea Lamarck, 1801: comments by Dr. L. B. Cox, Dr. W. J. Arkell, Dr. Myra Keen and Professor Siemon W. Muller, and Dr. D. T. Donovan 324-333

Cardinia Agassiz, [1841]: comment by Dr. W. J. Arkell .. 334

Scaphander Montfort, 1810: comment by Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. 334

Ammonites Bruguière, 1789: trivial name *angulatus* Schlotheim, 1820 (as published in combination *Ammonites angulatus*); *Arniocera* Hyatt, 1867, and *Liparoceras* Hyatt, 1867: comments by Dr. D. T. Donovan.. 335-336

Ammonites Bruguière, 1789: comment by Mr. C. W. Wright .. 336

Planulites and *Orbulites* Lamarck, 1801, *Pelagus* and *Ellipsolithes* Montfort, 1808, *Globites* de Haan, 1825: comment by Mr. C. W. Wright 337

Arieticeras Quentedt, 1883: comment by Professor H. Engel .. 337

Pleurocera Rafinesque, 1818: comment by Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. 338

Capsus Fabricius, 1803: comment by S. v. Kéler 338

Mytilus Linnaeus, 1758: comment by Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. 339

CONTENTS

(*continued from overleaf*)

Comments on previously published applications—*continued*

Crangon Fabricius, 1798, and *Alpheus* Fabricius, 1798 : comments by Dr. Waldo L. Schmitt ; Dr. Marie V. Lebour ; Dr. Frank A. McNeill ; Dr. A. B. Needler ; Professor H. Nouvel .. 340-343

Crangon Fabricius, 1798 ; *Ligia* Fabricius, 1798 ; *Scyllarides* Gill, 1898 ; *Lysiosquilla* Dana, 1852 ; *Odontodactylus* Bigelow, 1893 : comments by Professor Heinrich Balss and Professor E. Sollaud 344

Ligia Fabricius, 1798 : comment by Professor A. Vandel .. 345

Monoculus Linnaeus, 1758 : comment by Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. 345

Dorilas Meigen, 1800 : comment by Professor D. Elmo Hardy .. 346–347

Tylos Meigen, 1800 : comment by Professor A. Vandel .. 347

Titania, *Dorilas*, *Tendipes*, *Philia*, and *Tylos* Meigen, 1800 : comment by Dr. W. Hennig 348

ajax Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ajax*) : comments by Mr. C. F. dos Passos and Professor E. M. Hering 349–350

sirtalis Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Coluber sirtalis*) : comments by Dr. Laurence Klauber and Dr. Murray L. Johnson 351–352

Important Notice

Part 12 of the present volume containing the Title Page, Table of Contents and Indexes is in the press and will be published shortly.

Publications of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

All inquiries regarding the publications issued by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, should be addressed to the Publications Officer, Offices of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

Printed in Great Britain by METCHIM & SON, LIMITED, Westminster, London